

Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application in light of the remarks in this paper. Claims 1-27 have been rejected. Claims 1, 2, 10, 11, 17, 18, 25, and 26 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Thus, claims 1-27 are pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Megiddo, et al. ("Megiddo", US# 6,892,181). In paragraph 4, the Office Action states:

As per independent claim 1, Megiddo discloses a method to view information comprising:

Displaying a first web page having dynamically changing information content segments (column 4 lines 37-45); dynamically changing one or more of the information content segments (column 1 lines 31-45); ordering a list of information content segments that have previously appeared on a web page, wherein said web page is displayed in a first area of an information display (Figure 3b); and includes the information content segments that have previously appeared on the web page (Figure 3b, old ads); and displaying said list of information content segments to be viewed concurrently with said web page (Column 4 lines 16-20, Figure 3b).

(p. 2-3, Office Action – November 16, 2005)

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

"A claim is anticipated only if *each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "*The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.*" *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

MPEP § 2131 (emphasis added)

Megiddo fails to disclose at least “associating the list of information content segments with the first web page; and displaying the list of information content segments to be viewed concurrently with the first web page and a representation of the second web page,” a limitation of amended claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 (with emphasis added) reads:

A method to view information comprising:
displaying a first web page having dynamically changing information content segments;
dynamically changing one or more of the information content segments;
displaying a second web page;
ordering a list of information content segments that have previously appeared on the first web page wherein said web page is displayed in a first area of an information display and includes the information content segments that have previously appeared on the web page;
associating the list of information content segments *with the first web page*; and
displaying the list of information content segments to be viewed concurrently with *the first web page and* a representation of *the second web page*.

Claims 10, 17, and 25 each disclose similar limitations.

Thus Applicants claim concurrent display of information content segments associated with the first web page, the first web page, and a representation of the second web page. This may be useful, for example, to provide a user who visits multiple web pages a method of navigation between the web pages and their associated information content segments. As of the time of the invention, returning to a previously viewed web page did not necessarily display the previously viewed information content concurrently with the web page and a representation of a subsequently viewed web page.

In contrast, Megiddo teaches cumulative display of advertisements that have previously appeared as between two distinct web pages.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit Megiddo does not anticipate amended Claim 1. Further, because Claims 10, 17, and 25 incorporate similar limitations, Applicants respectfully submit they are similarly distinguished from Megiddo.

Because Claims 2-4, 7, and 9 are dependent on claim 1; Claims 11-14, and 16 are dependent on claim 10; Claims 18-20, and 23 are dependent on Claim 17; and, Claims 26 and 27 are dependent on Claim 25; they incorporate the limitations of Claims 1, 10, 17, and 25, respectively and are thus distinguishable from Megiddo for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1, 10, 17, and 25.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 6, 21, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Megiddo, et al. ("Megiddo", US# 6,892,181) in view of Rice ("Rice", US# 6486891). In paragraph 7, the Office Action recites

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo fails to disclose a method wherein said information display is a projection of light on a surface. However Rice teaches a method wherein said information display is a projection of light on a surface (Column 4 lines 15-16). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Megiddo's method with Rice's teaching. Motivation to so do would have been to allow the display of the information to display advertisements to an Internet user browsing the World Wide Web.

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Megiddo fails to disclose a method wherein said information display is comprised of electrically powered display elements. However, Rice teaches a method wherein said information display is comprised of electrically powered display elements (Column 4 lines 17-20). Therefore it would have been obvious to combine Dustin's method with Rice's teaching. Motivation to so do would have been to allow the display of the information to display advertisements to an Internet user browsing the World Wide Web.

Claim 21 is similar in scope to claim 5 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale. Claim 22 is similar in scope to claim 6 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

(p. 5, Office Action 11/16/2005).

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is not obvious in view of Megiddo and Rice because being dependent on Claim 1, Claim 5 incorporates the limitations of Claim 1. Megiddo and Rice individually lack at least the limitation of amended Claim 1

associating the list of information content segments with the first web page; and

displaying the list of information content segments to be viewed concurrently with the first web page and a representation of the second web page.

As explained above, Megiddo teaches cumulative display of advertisements that have previously appeared as between two distinct web pages, but fails to teach the referenced limitation of claim 1. As relied on by Examiner, “Rice teaches a method wherein said information display is a projection of light on a surface (Column 4, lines 15-16).” **P. 5**

Office Action 11/16/2005.

Thus, any combination of Megiddo and Rice similarly lacks the referenced limitation of amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit claim 5 is not rendered obvious by Megiddo, in light of Rice.

Because Claim 6 incorporates the limitations of Claim 1, Applicants submit Claim 6 is not rendered obvious by Megiddo for reasons similar to those above in support of Claim 5. Further, Claims 21 and 22 recite limitations similar to claims 5 and 6, respectively, and thus, Applicants submit, are not rendered obvious by Megiddo under similar rationale.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims **1-27** are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: Feb 16, 2006


Paul A. Mendonsa
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 439-8778